

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/530,388		07/06/2000	WOLFGANG STELZIG	10191/1355	7376	
26646	7590	07/13/2006		EXAMINER		
		YON LLP	HARPER, KEVIN C			
ONE BRO NEW YO		10004		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,			2616		
				DATE MAIL ED 07/12/2007		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			SV			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	V			
	09/530,388	STELZIG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin C. Harper	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addres	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 A	nril 2006					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	nce except for formal matters, pro		erits is			
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 10-22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 10-12 and 16-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 13-15 and 19-22 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:		·)			

Application/Control Number: 09/530,388 Page 2

Art Unit: 2616

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 26, 2006 with respect to Hayashi in view of Mosebrook have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Mosebrook does not disclose determining a time slot belonging to the bus station based on position information of a transmitting bus station and the position of the bus station. However, in Mosebrook the bus stations transmit in sequence (fig. 18) such that information received is only transmitted during an appropriate time slot based on the position of the transmitting bus station and the position of the bus station receiving the information (col. 24, lines 56-58; col. 27, lines 11-14; col. 27, lines 27-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 10-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5,907,540) in view of Mosebrook et al. (US 5,848,054).

2. Regarding claims 10 and 12, Hayashi discloses a bus station (fig. 1, items A-E) for exchanging with other bus stations communications including a data packet (fig. 7) and transmission information (fig. 10, item 13d and 13e). The bus station stores position information in relation to a sequence of bus stations (fig. 12, step 806; col. 11, lines 35-41) and forwards a received data packet (col. 12, lines 35-42). However, Hayashi does not disclose determining a time slot belonging to the bus station based on position information and transmitting the packet in the next time slot belonging to the bus station. Mosebrook discloses bus stations that

Application/Control Number: 09/530,388 Page 3

Art Unit: 2616

determine an appropriate time slot for transmission based on position (fig. 1; col. 7, lines 3-9; col. 26, lines 48-61; fig. 22A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made for a bus station to determine an appropriate time period for communication in the invention of Hayashi in order to ensure that data is properly transmitted to a bus station device (Mosebrook, abstract, last six lines; note: sequenced time slots - fig. 18).

Regarding claims 11 and 16-17, in Hayashi a direction vector indicates a sequence that will be run from a source to a destination (fig. 10, item 12f - RSAF; col. 9, lines 5-16; col. 9, line 63 through col. 10, line 2; col. 10, lines 3-5 and 10-13).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Mosebrook as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Faber (US 5,369,745).

4. Regarding claim 18, Hayashi in view of Mosebrook does not disclose selecting a packet for transmission based on a shorter remaining transit time. Faber discloses selecting a packet for transmission based on remaining transit time (col. 3, lines 40-45) where the unselected packet is not transmitted (processed). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit a packet with the shorter remaining transit time in the invention of Hayashi in view of Mosebrook in order to reduce congestion within the network by transmitting the data packet which will reach its destination soonest (Faber, col. 1, lines 18-25).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 13-15 and 19-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-3166. The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 11:00 AM to 7:00 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To, can be reached at 571-272-7629. The centralized fax number for the Patent Office is 571-273-8300. For non-official communications, the examiner's personal fax number is 571-273-3166 and the examiner's e-mail address is kevin harper@uspto.gov.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Application/Control Number: 09/530,388

Art Unit: 2616

applications associated with a customer number is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see portal uspto gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin C. Harper

Page 5

July 9, 2006